## REMARKS

The Official Action of November 16, 2006, has been carefully reviewed. The claims in the application are now claims 1, 6-7 and 9-23, and the claims have been amended so that claims 6-23 are now in proper multiply dependent form and can receive a first examination on the merits. The applicant believes the claims define patentable subject matter and should be allowed, and therefore requests favorable reconsideration and allowance.

Acknowledgement by the PTO of the receipt of applicant's papers filed under Section 119 is noted.

The abstract has been objected to, and so a new abstract is presented herewith to replace the criticized abstract.

The specification has been objected to as not containing headings, and correction has been required.

Applicant respectfully traverses the objection and rejection.

Headings are not mandatory, but are only suggested.

Applicant believes headings are unnecessary for the present application, but has no objection to the examiner inserting same by examiner's amendment if the examiner chooses to do so.

Claims 1-5 have been rejected under the second paragraph of §112. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant believes that there is nothing wrong with the claims being in narrative form. On the other hand, applicant does not want to argue when arguments are unnecessary. Accordingly, the claims have been amended substantially bearing in mind the examiner's comments.

For the record, however, applicant believes the claims as previously drafted, especially when considered in light of applicant's specification (fully consistent with the law), would not have been confusing to those skilled in the art, and therefore the claims in their previous form are fully in accordance with §112. At worst, the claims in their previous form might be considered objectionable, but only as to form, requiring no substantial amendments relating to patentability.

Withdrawal of the rejection is in order and is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 have been rejected under §102 as anticipated by Knapp USP 1,138,668 (Knapp). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While applicant does not necessarily agree with the rejection, nevertheless claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of claims 2 and 8. Even if Knapp

were to have anticipated claim 1 in its original form, Knapp clearly does not anticipate claim 1 in its present form. In addition, applicant does not see that either Knapp of any other prior art makes obvious the features of original claim 8, particularly in conjunction with the features of original claim 2. Applicant also does not see that any of the other prior art either anticipates or makes obvious claim 1 as amended above.

All the other claims depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, and thus incorporate the features of claim 1. Accordingly, these claims are patentable for the same reasons as claim 1; and, in addition, many of these subsidiary claims add features in the dependent portions thereof which are not shown or made obvious by any known prior art.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon by the PTO have been noted, along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently material to warrant their application against any of applicant's claims.

Appln. No. 10/517,376 Amd. dated May 16, 2007 Reply to Office Action of November 16, 2006

Applicant believes that all issues raised in the Official Action have been addressed above in a manner that should lead to patentability of the present application. Favorable consideration and early formal allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.

Attorneys for Applicant

Ву

Sheridan Neimark

Registration No. 20,520

SN:kg

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197 Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\BN\C\Call\coenraets11\Pto\2007-05-16 PCTAMD.doc